

AF/IRW

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA22313-1450 on 8/7/05 By [Signature] Printed: Carmen Pili Ekstrom



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of: Léonel Yanez MARTINEZ.

Serial No. 10/613,433

Art Unit: 2931

Filed: July 3, 2003

Examiner: William Mayo

For: **DRY WATER RESISTANT COAXIAL CABLE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE THEREOF**

Assistant Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION in the above-identified application.

   Small Entity status of this application under 37 C.F.R. 1.9 and 1.27 has been established by a verified statement previously submitted.

   A verified Statement to establish small entity status under 37 C.F.R. 1.9 and 1.27 is enclosed.

   No additional fee is required.

The fee has been calculated as shown below:

Claims	Highest Number Filed	Present Extra	Small Entity		Other Than A Small Entity		Fee
			Rate	Addit. (or)	Rate	Addit.	
Total 20	-40=	20	x 9 =	\$180	x 18 =		\$ 180.00
Indep. 3	-2 =	0	x 43 =	\$	x 86 =		\$

   First Presentation of

Multiple Dependent Claims   +145 = \$     + 290 = \$  

Total Additional Fee   \$  

   A check in the amount of \$            is attached for:                                 

   If a Petition for Extension of Time is necessary and the Petition and/or the check is not enclosed, this will act as the Petition and applicant herewith petitions the Commissioner to extend the time for response.

Attorney Docket No. MX/JFC-Serv-001

Date: August 7, 2005

727 Sunshine Dr. Los Altos, CA 94024

650 960-1936

By: [Signature]

Carmen Pili Ekstrom

Reg. No. 34,981

1722513-145  
 OIPE JC106  
 AUG 10 2005  
 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE  
 And Applicant

~~4140~~ Application of:

) **AFTER FINAL (Expedited Processing)**

**Group Art Unit: 2831**

**Examiner: William Mayo II**

)  
)  
)  
)  
)

)

Sir:

## RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

The Examiner deemed that the restriction requirement was deemed proper and made FINAL. Applicants intend to file a Petition regarding the restriction requirement before filing a Notice of Appeal or before allowance of the patent application. Therefore, Applicants did not cancel the claims withdrawn from consideration.

Applicants continue to argue that Group I requires the combination with Group II as discussed in the Applicants' specification. It is submitted that these groups are related as combination/subcombination. The requisite distinctness to support the restriction requirement has not been shown because the combination as claimed requires the